CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 1. APRIL, 1917. Vol. VII.

OUR SEVENTH YEAR.

With this number the *Modern Churchman* enters on its seventh year. Never have the prospects of our cause looked brighter. The patient and courageous work of many—the dead even more than the living—is beginning to promise a commensurate result. The opponents of our ideals are losing *moral*. There is evidence of this in the most unexpected quarters.

Two events of absurdly different dimensions have helped conspicuously to advance our cause.

The first of these is the War.

> "On the earth distress of nations; men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of the heavens shall be shaken."

That is the materialist's outlook. The Christian's outlook is that of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*:—

> "Yet once more I shake not the earth but the heavens also; and that word, *Yet once more*, signifieth the removal of the things that are shaken as of things that are made, that the things which cannot be shaken may remain."

The War, like the Reformation and the French Revolution, is an agent for advancing the Kingdom of God. It is a world-shaker, but it is a heaven-shaker also, at least of that man-made heaven which rests on the earth. Ecclesiastical unrealities and religious idols are falling in heaps.

Liberal Churchmen have known that these things were bound to collapse when the shake came, and so they urged the Church to build betimes on more secure foundations. But the Church officially has taken little heed to their advice, with the result that there is a serious prospect of the great bulk of the nation being left ecclesiastically homeless. However, be that as it may, the War has produced a crash in ecclesiastical constructions. It is a day "when the high towers fall," and the process is only beginning.

The second event is the National Mission. This has had a curious and quite unexpected result. It was inaugurated in the hope of converting the nation. This it signally failed to achieve; but it has narrowly missed converting the Church to the urgent necessity of new methods.

The effect, or non-effect, of the National Mission was to open the eyes of the more wide-awake of the Church's leaders to the rapidly declining influence of the Church—a decline which was probably accelerated by the refusal of the Church authorities to allow the clergy to enlist as combatants.

It became evident, even to conservatives, that the Church had done her best on traditional lines, and had failed! Therefore, if the Church were to be saved, a drastic change in policy must be effected. Our Primate thereupon appointed five committees to enquire into the Church's condition. We await their reports, and earnestly hope that they will advise his Grace with more insight than did the Sanhedrin which advocated the National Mission as the panacea of the national religious distemper, and that they will not at the conclusion of their labours present him with a set of boomerangs in the belief that they are Lewis guns.

At present there is no general agreement as to the right remedy for the Church's complaint—the symptoms of which appear to be intermittent aphasia and loss of energy.

Prescriptions, however, are being pressed on our authorities from all sides, but it is hardly possible for the patient to take all the prescriptions and survive.

Some prescribe the thorough re-organisation of the Church's finances and the re-distribution of her endowments. This appeals to the poorer clergy and to the business instincts of the nation as quite the right thing.

Others prescribe the suppression of mediaeval ritualism and Roman doctrine, and urge a stern insistence on a legal uniformity. This, however, is thought by many to be like bleeding—a somewhat old-fashioned remedy and too weakening to the system.

Others, who are convinced that the illness of the Church is due to Biblical Higher Criticism and Modern Theology, prescribe sitting in darkened rooms and the wearing of tinted spectacles; but their opponents believe that it is more light that the Church needs, and more warmth.

Others prescribe the full Catholic doctrine, practice and ritual, as the sovereign remedy; but as it is generally believed that they have miswritten their prescription by putting Catholic where they really mean Roman, the authorities have bid them re-write it carefully in plain letters.

Others prescribe housing the bishops in semi-detached villas and compelling them to ride in trams. Many think, however, that this remedy is hardly radical enough, and that it ought to be extended to all Christian men; yet it is felt that it might produce a good effect if only the British public could be got to believe that the bishops themselves are the originators and enthusiastic supporters of this reform.

Others again urge quite another kind of prescription. Like Victor Hugo, they believe that a bishop may be a really good man, and that, in that case, you cannot have too many of them. So they propose to re-vitalise the Church by multiplying them until they are as plentiful as blackberries.

Others prescribe that all the clergy shall immediately become active members of the various socialist organizations and support the policy of the I.L.P. Churchmen, however, who do not belong to the Labour Party are not inclined to think that this is the right remedy, though probably all feel that the Church ought to help in the work of social re-construction and betterment.

Others prescribe the popularization of Church services. As, however, the reformers cannot all agree upon one method of doing it, the authorities apparently think it best not to legalise any of their prescriptions.

Others prescribe that the Church shall be freed from the practical control of Parliament and be managed instead by her bishops, but at the same time retain all her endowments

and privileges. While some Churchmen regard this as a very sound prescription, there are not a few who think that it involves reckoning without your host, especially your Non-conformist host.

As Modern Churchmen we would prescribe a powerful infusion of *Spiritus Christi*. *Item*, two pills, consisting of the modern education of the clergy and the concession of legal powers to the parochial laity, both men and women. And we also advocate that the patient, by way of daily exercise, should strenuously endeavour to grow an abundant harvest of the fruits of the Spirit for national consumption.

Some who wish not well unto our Zion, will interpret this multiplicity of prescriptions as denoting panic and chaos in the Church, and as certain in the end to bring about the death of the patient. We, however, take a more hopeful view; the patient is not yet dead, and the doctors are being changed.

No one can tell what lies ahead of the Church; possibly disestablishment, disendowment, and disruption; but what we hope for is re-constitution on a really national, democratic, and comprehensive basis. Every thinking Englishman predicts that something is going to happen to the Church, but whether it be the Day of Judgment she deserves, or whether it be the Millennial Dawn of Divine Grace, depends on the temperament of the prophets. At any rate, the old complacency and traditional conservatism are dead; the old *non possumus* attitude is dying; the old conspiracy of silence is broken up; the old official Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic parties are "nigh unto vanishing." It is true that these parties still cling fondly to the pleasing illusion that they represent the Church of England, but there are signs that even our official Church organ, the *Guardian*, knows better than that.

Of course we cannot predict what is going to happen to the Church of England. In these matters the heart is apt to over-rule the head. But although we know not the future of our Church, at least we do know that all is well with the Kingdom of God, which, once again, is coming with power.

GOD AND THE WAR.

By the Rev. DAVID DORRITY, B.D., Rector of St. Ann's, Manchester.

Since this Armageddon began we have been repeatedly invited—especially by some of the clergy and bishops—to accept the view that it is the direct visitation of God upon us for our national sins, and they instance in particular drunkenness, immorality, luxury, sabbath-breaking, neglect of public worship, *et hoc genus omne*. Hence the war is utilised to voice a call to national repentance, and is repeatedly linked with such words as "punishment," "chastisement," "visitation of God," and so on. These well-intentioned but misguided teachers do not seem to realise that Christian men may dissent altogether from such teaching, and are indeed bound in the interests of true religion and of historic fact to meet it with a direct negative.

It seems as certain as any fact of history can well be that the Germans had for years past planned an extensive scheme of German expansion which was bound to involve one great struggle if not a series of bloody wars. A favourable opportunity, so it appeared to Germany, for entering on the first of these befell in August, 1914, and she seized upon it to deluge Europe with blood. *It was the Pan-Germanic ideal which caused the war*, and this ideal was due partly to the extraordinary success which had attended the aggressive military policy of Bismarck, and partly to the notion inculcated by Treitschke, Bernhardi, Houston Chamberlain, and a host of other Teutonic professors and publicists that the German race was superior to all other races, and therefore had a perfect right to seize the material possessions of its neighbours who in German eyes were racially inferior and nationally decadent.

Therefore to make God or the sins of England responsible for the war is simply preposterous. Not God or this nation's sins are the cause of the war, but Germany's national vanity and lust of dominion. Of course this is not to say that we have no sins, national or individual, of which we have need to

repent, but it is to deny that they are the cause of our being involved in the war. Had we been worse than we are, false to our plighted word, indifferent to the sufferings of our friends, incapable of manly resolution and heroic sacrifice, which thank God we are not! we might conceivably have escaped the war altogether, or have deferred it. Whereas had we possessed all those virtues which our spiritual pastors and masters desire for us; had we been sober, moral, sabbath-keeping, God-fearing, simple in our life and Spartan in our manners, we should have been under no less moral obligation to fight. In short had we been a nation of saints, we should still have had to fight and suffer.

The sooner therefore we frankly abandon in our preaching and prayers, in our conference speeches and episcopal utterances any suggestion that the war has come upon us as a punishment for our national sins, the better will it be in the interests of historic truth and of true religion. Such suggestions, however well-intentioned, have, we believe, done much to weaken Englishmen's belief in God or in the intelligence of their religious teachers, because they feel that if it be really a fact that God is punishing the nation for its sins He is going about it in an uncommonly slip-shod manner, for many of His punishments fall most heavily upon our best and bravest, and leave not a few of the least virtuous and lovable of our fellow-citizens unscathed.

As the war proceeds, and its strain becomes more and more severe, we need increasingly the strength and consolation which come from the deep and true feeling that unworthy as we are, we are yet fighting and suffering not as God's rebels but as His sons; that we are fighting and suffering as peace-makers not as militarists; that we are fighting and suffering to crush an intolerable and inhuman tyranny, and to bring in a new age—and above all to feel the need for persevering loyalty to these great ideals.

Bishop Butler remarked that in his view men made too free in their speculations about the Divine goodness, "which was

not a disposition to make *all* men happy, but only the good;" and I similarly feel that too many are making a good deal too free just now with a presumed knowledge of the Divine intention and Divine action in relation to this war.

At any rate, instead of calling it a Divine "chastisement" or "visitation," I should prefer to speak of it as a Divine *vocation* —a call from God to perform an honourable duty, and to bear a conspicuous part in advancing His kingdom in this world. And notwithstanding our sufferings and losses, we cannot feel sufficiently thankful that we did respond to that call.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide
In the strife of Truth and Falsehood for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
And the choice goes by for ever, 'twixt *that* darkness and *that* light."

We made our choice. Morally, we had no option. But the result is that, in spite of manifold sins and weaknesses, we stand before the world to-day as champions of fidelity to treaties; the would-be defenders of weaker States against a brutal and inhuman militarism; upholders of the principle that small nationalities have as much right to "a place in the sun," and to accomplish their national destiny and development on their own lines and according to their own aspirations, as their more powerful neighbours.

This war has been called "hell with the lid off," but it has compensations when it is war in a great and good cause.

The tide of battle sways backwards and forwards, and results must be achieved by men looking to God for strength and wisdom, but not expecting any external or miraculous intervention of the Deity. Some things are impossible with God, since He cannot—or rather *will* not—force man to act against his will, and so man can hinder and even frustrate the Divine intention; still, it is no small source of strength to feel that we are fighting His fight, under His banner, and beneath the sunshine of His smile, and I am glad of this opportunity of attempting, however feebly and briefly, to clear both His character and our own.

THE LOST LEADER.

A Memorial which is rather more of an ultimatum than a petition has been put forth by a thousand Anglican clergymen. It deals with reservation of the sacrament. What the memorialists demand is not reservation for communicating the sick. That, like the mixed chalice, is a very ancient Christian custom and goes back to the second century, if not more probably to the first. The demand of the Memorialists is for reservation for purposes of adoration. This is a late custom and is closely connected with that view of the sacrament which in mediaeval scholastic circles took the doctrinal form of transubstantiation. That view is one which demands the adoration of the eucharistic elements as being the actual body and blood of the Redeemer.

The Reformed Church of England, as Archbishop Temple affirmed, forbids reservation for any purpose. Bishop Gore, on the plea that he possessed "lawful authority," recently authorized reservation for the sick in certain cases, but when the present Memorialists demanded reservation for the purpose of adoration he declined to permit it, and has declared that the action of the Memorialists fills him with something like despair.

The action of the Memorialists fills us neither with despair nor with surprise. It is but the logical and natural outcome of a type of teaching and practice of which Bishop Gore himself, and organizations with which he has been closely connected, have been the active agents. Canon Simpson, when Principal of Leeds Clergy School, pointed out in his first edition of *The Thing Signified*, the unsatisfactory character of the sacramental teaching of Bishop Gore's volume *The Body of Christ*. Bishop Gore's position in that volume seemed bound, if pressed, to surrender to the Roman attack. It was not pure Canterbury, which is a thoroughly defensible and consistent position, and as distinctive in its way as are the Roman, Lutheran, and Zwinglian positions.

We have no mind here to enter upon Sacramental controversies or to condemn the sacramental views of any of our

fellow-Christians of whatever denomination. Our point is that Bishop Gore has no reasonable cause either for surprise or complaint at what has just happened. He has encouraged and cultivated the worship of the Sacramental Elements, although he has neither held nor taught explicitly the philosophical theory of transubstantiation. In practice he has deliberately done that which pure Canterbury forbids as idolatrous. The rubric at the end of the Communion office pronounces that "the Sacramental Bread and Wine [*i.e.*, after consecration] may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." This statement is thoroughly in harmony with Article XXVIII. We do not think that Bishop Gore will deny that he has practised the cultus of the sacrament, and does still practise it, yet it is only an ardent desire for further opportunities for the cultus of the sacrament, which has prompted the Memorialists' demand for reservation for adoration. Hence for Bishop Gore to rebuke the Memorialists and to refuse to accede to their demand is an example of that fatal inconsistency which must ever mark the conduct of those who are not loyal to principles. That the bishop is a good man, a clever man, a charming man, we do not deny, but he is also an inconsistent man, and therefore we fear must forfeit all claims to confidence as a leader. If it be not idolatrous and not contrary to Church of England principles to worship the sacramental elements on the altar at the time of celebration, it cannot be idolatrous or contrary to Church of England principles to worship the sacramental elements in the Pyx and Tabernacle, and so Exposition and Benediction and private sacramental devotions may reasonably be conceded to Church of England clergymen. In any case, human nature being what it is, it is absurd to try and restrict "the cultus of the blessed sacrament" by such artificial barriers as the bishop erects between its "liturgical" and "extra-liturgical" cultus. He who with his whole heart practises the cultus of the blessed sacrament worships the sacramental elements whenever and wherever he can get near

them to worship them, whether liturgically or extra-liturgically, and he rightly demands that this necessity of his spiritual life shall not be with-held from him. Bishop Gore seems to us to have forgotten what the ardour of "Catholic" devotion to the Blessed Sacrament really is when he offers so feeble a barrier as the distinction between the "liturgical" and "extra-liturgical" cultus of it.

Protestants may applaud the Bishop's splendid firmness in sternly repulsing the Memorialists; we only see in it the opportunist and inconsistent policy of "the Lost Leader." The Memorialists are the logical and whole-hearted victims of the bishop's inconsistent leadership—a leadership of which Liberals know something in the case of Biblical criticism.

From many points of view, exegetical, historical, theological, we are bound to regard the Memorialists as mistaken in their attitude to the sacramental elements, but we doubt if argument could alter their view. With them it is in most cases, we believe, an affair of the heart and not of the head, and therefore it should be treated tenderly. If the Memorialists are still loyal in their heart to the Church of England, and can still call her mother with sincere and single-minded affection, doubtless she can still call them sons. If however they have gone from her in their heart, and look with love and longing to Rome as the true home of their souls, then certainly they would be happier if they entered her historic and inviting portals, whither so many of their friends have lately gone.

Yet in our judgment it is not different views with regard to the sacrament which need cause a schism in the Church, but only different views when held and practised in a sectarian and intolerant spirit. There are Christians to-day, a growing number, who in a spirit of thankfulness and love can share in a Roman Mass, an Anglican Celebration, a Nonconformist Lord's Supper, and experience a sense of spiritual communion and Christian fellowship at each, believing that where two or three are gathered together in Christ's Name, He is there in the midst.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

By the Rev. F. E. Warner, M.A., Rector of Amberley, Gloucester.

The prominence assigned to women is a significant feature in the brief records of our Lord's life and ministry. It is a woman whom the Church regards as the highest of all the saints—the humble maiden of Nazareth who was blessed above all women in being chosen to be the Mother of the World's Redeemer. When He went forth on His work of ministry, that ministry was carried on as freely among women as among men. St. John records how on one occasion His disciples were amazed at His "speaking with a woman" (Jn. iv. 27 R.V.); yet He did not consider this woman, albeit a heretic in religion and of dubious morality, incapable of receiving His sublime teaching on true worship and the declaration of His Messiahship. In His solemn assertion of the indissolubility of marriage, and in the absolution pronounced on the harlot and the adulteress, we may see that He regarded men and women on precisely the same footing, and that the idea of a double standard in sexual morality was as abhorrent to Him as it should be to all His followers. A company of devoted women, St. Luke tells us, were with Him on His missionary journeys, and contributed to the support of Himself and His apostles. Women were last at His cross, and first at His tomb, and women were chosen to receive the first tidings of His resurrection, and to be the first witnesses of the risen Lord. At the first meeting of the Church after the Ascension the historian is careful to record that not only were the eleven Apostles and the brethren of the Lord present but also "the women and Mary the mother of Jesus." These women would have been present on the Day of Pentecost, and shared in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost—that which St. Peter recognised as a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy:—

> "On My servants and *on My handmaidens* I will pour out in those days of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy."

Women are prominent in the history of the Early Church. It was to the house of a woman, Mary the mother of John Mark, where many were gathered together praying for His deliverance, that St. Peter went on his release from Herod's prison (Acts xii. 12). St. Paul's first convert in Europe was a woman, and he and Silas accepted the hospitality of her house at Philippi (Acts xvi. 14-15). The learned and eloquent Apollos owed his fuller instruction in the Christian faith to a gifted woman (Acts xviii. 26). Here it may be worth noting that, while Aquila and Priscilla are mentioned together six times, in four out of the six the wife's name precedes that of the husband. Some commentators have suggested that she was of higher social standing than he. Let us hope that the vice of snobbishness had not yet so infected the Church, and that the priority of name denotes a superiority in spiritual rather than in material things. The number of women's names occurring in Rom. xvi. is another indication of their influence and activity in the Apostolic Church.

In considering the position of women with regard to the ministry of the Church, it should be borne in mind that there were two types of ministry in the Early Church, *i.e.*, the irregular or charismatic ministry of the "prophets," and the local ministry of the bishops or presbyters and deacons. There is clear evidence that women had a place in both these types of ministry.

In Rom. xvi. 1, St. Paul commends to the Roman Church "Phoebe our sister, who is a servant (*διάκονος*, R.V. marg. deaconess) of the church that is at Cenchreae." In the midst of a passage dealing with the qualifications for deacons in 1 Tim. iii. is a verse (v. 2), which the Revised Version renders thus:—"Women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, temperate, faithful in all things." There can be no doubt that the verse refers, not to women in general, nor to the wives of deacons as the Authorised Version takes it, but to deaconesses. There is a reference to such in Pliny's well-known letter to the Emperor Trajan, where he relates his effort to obtain

information of the puzzling sect of Christians by putting to the torture two female slaves, *quae ministrae dicebantur. Ministrae* is, of course, the Latin equivalent of the Greek *διάκονοι*. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-220) and Origen (c. 185-225) refer to the New Testament passages quoted above, as showing that women had a place in the ministry of the Church in Apostolic times. From the *Didascalia* and *Apostolic Constitutions*, which embody documents going back as far as the third century, we find that the deaconess was ordained by the bishop, and a form of ordination is given. Her duties were to take charge of the female catechumens, instructing them in the faith and preparing them for baptism, to visit and relieve the sick and needy (in accordance with the original institution of the diaconate), and to carry the Blessed Sacrament to women who were ill. She was also to be ready, if required, to act as a messenger for the Church (cp. Phoebe as above). Later on, she had charge of the sanctuary with the usual duties of sacristan, and there is, at least, some evidence that on occasion she administered the chalice at the Eucharist. The order was at the height of its development in the fourth century. St. Chrysostom had no less than forty deaconesses attached to the principal church of Constantinople. But, in course of time, the order gradually declined and became extinct in the West, lingering rather longer in the East, and many of the duties of the deaconess were fulfilled by her younger sister the nun. Prayers, however, for the making of deaconesses exist as late as the York Pontifical of Egbert (A.D. 732) and the Leofric Missal of A.D. 1072. Other interesting vestiges still remain. In France, to this day, the Benedictine abbesses (the most ancient of all the Western monastic orders) receive the ordination of a deaconess, while at least one order of nuns retains among its privileges the right of its members to receive at their profession the stole and maniple, a reminiscence of the time when the deaconess in the Eastern and Western Churches received the stole at her ordination. About the middle of last century the possibilities

of increased usefulness for women in the work of the Church began to be recognised. The first Anglican sisterhood was founded in 1847, and an effort was made, both in the Church of England and in the American Episcopal Church, to revive the ancient order of deaconesses. In America the office was revived in 1855, and in our own Church Elizabeth Ferrard was ordained deaconess by Archbishop Tait, then Bishop of London, in 1862. This revival, which owed its inception largely to the work of Dean Howson, won the support of such sober and cautious bishops as Harold Browne, who, when Bishop of Ely, founded the second Deaconess House at Bedford, Moberly of Salisbury, and Walsham How. In 1891 the following resolution was passed by the Upper House of Convocation:—

> "Deaconesses having, according to the best authorities, formed an order of ministry in the Early Church, and having proved their efficiency in the Anglican Church, whenever the order has been revived, it is desirable to encourage the formation of Deaconess Institutions, and the work of deaconesses in our dioceses and parishes."

In 1897 the revived office was recognised by the Lambeth Conference which met in that year. It is, perhaps, curiously significant of the practical obliteration of the third order of the ministry, for the modern diaconate is hardly thought of as a distinct order, but merely as a year's novitiate for the priesthood, that the question "Why should not women be admitted to holy orders?" should have been argued exclusively with reference to the priesthood. Let us at least start with this fact, that in the Primitive Church, to quote Bishop Gore:—

> "The diaconate, or third order, was conferred upon both (sc. men and women). Deaconesses were regarded as an order of clergy."

We may surely believe that whatever grace of orders is bestowed upon the deacon is bestowed also upon the deaconess. May we not look for the time when every well-ordered parish shall have upon its staff at least one deaconess, duly ordained to her sacred office by the laying-on of hands of the bishop? The possibilities of women's work in our Church are great indeed, and that work will surely be carried out more efficiently by a thoroughly trained and duly commissioned minister of

the Church than if it be left to the well-meaning but often injudicious efforts of the amateur. The first ordinations of deaconesses after the revival of the order took place in the study of London House. There is no reason now for such a hole-and-corner proceeding. Why should they not be ordained in the Cathedral Church of the diocese at the regular ordination seasons? And let them be regularly appointed to parishes by the bishop's licence, and their names appear as an order of clergy in the Diocesan Calendar. There would, of course, be scope for communities of deaconesses as well as for those engaged in parish work, as we have our Cowleys and Mirfields as well as the parochial clergy. One well qualified to speak, affirms that:—

> "The ablest women of the day are not—with some notable exceptions—giving their lives to the direct service of the Church, and, however valuable their service is to the nation, the loss of it to the Church is serious to contemplate."*

If the Church is to remedy this, let it offer them that place in its ministry which, on the grounds of Holy Scripture, the practice of the Primitive Church, and the light of reason, they may rightly claim.

The recent controversy on the question of women messengers for the National Mission suggests an inquiry into the exercise of the prophetic ministry by women. St. Philip, "the evangelist, who was one of the seven," is recorded by St. Luke, who had been his guest at Caesarea, as having "four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy" (Acts xxi. 9). Indeed, that the prophetic ministry should have been exercised by women as well as by men, is only what we should have expected from the prophecy of Joel, fulfilled at Pentecost. St. Paul refers to the exercise of this gift by women at Corinth, assuming that they prophesy and pray in the church, but directing that they should do so veiled. (1 Cor. xi. 5). What, then, are we to make of the prohibition which occurs a little later in the very same Epistle:—"Let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak." (ch. xiv. 33)? It

* Miss Gollock.

seems hardly credible that he can be refusing here what he had apparently already sanctioned. Note that he does not, in this second passage, mention prophesying and praying, but uses the verb λαλεῖν, to "speak," or, rather, "talk." The context shows that he is thinking of interruptions in the assembly, caused by the women asking questions, adding, as he does, "And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home." (v. 35). As modesty, especially in a city with so notorious a reputation as that of Corinth, should lead the woman who was exercising the gift of prophecy to come forward wearing a veil, so the position of married women rendered it more seemly for them to ask questions of their husbands at home rather than publicly in the Christian assembly. (St. Paul, however, does not tell us what the married woman, whose husband was a heathen, was to do?) As so often in reading his Epistles, we must bear in mind the local conditions of the Church to which he was writing. One other passage, assuming its Pauline authorship, we must consider:—"I suffer not a woman to teach . . . but to be in silence." (1 Tim. ii. 12). Remember, however, that if we are to take this strictly literally, it prohibits women teaching in the Sunday School—certainly in the case of classes of lads or young men. Moreover, if we are to regard this as a regulation binding the Church of future ages, what of verse 9 in the same chapter? Do we refuse to allow women to worship in our churches who have "braided hair, or gold or pearls or costly raiment?" If the one precept is to be literally obeyed, why not the other? But let us turn from these local and temporary precepts and read the true mind of the Apostle in the great principle he lays down in Gal. iii. 28:—"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." How slowly the Church has grasped it!—"Neither Jew nor Greek"—it was St. Paul's lifework, for which he endured misjudgment, bonds and imprisonment, to uphold this; "neither bond nor free"—it has taken centuries more to realise this; "neither

ale nor female"—this we have yet to learn—the absolute quality of the sexes in Christ. Returning to the prophetic inistry, which continued in the Early Church until the second third century, it is worth noting that one of the latest entioned representatives was a woman, Ammia in Philaelphia, who lived in the reign of Hadrian.

As the 19th century saw the revival of the office of deaconess our Church, so it may also be said to have witnessed the vival of opportunities for "prophecy" for women, and the oman speaker on Church platforms became a familiar sight, ven addressing (shades of our early Victorian forefathers!) atherings of both sexes. It is really difficult under present-ay conditions to understand why the very cautiously worded ermission of the Bishops of London and Chelmsford, allowing rtain women to speak in churches to congregations of women nly should have caused so violent an explosion of wrath; and ne may regret that the two bishops even in the interests of ace and quietness made such a prompt surrender to the reats and denunciations of obscurantists. What was the sult? Here is an illustration:—

> "In one parish a woman preached four times—twice on two successive Sundays—and though, in order to meet the commands of the bishop, matins and evensong were said in church, and the congregation solemnly adjourned to the schoolroom for the sermon, yet it gathered there and settled down to listen in numbers as though it had not left the church."*

Could anything be more ridiculous than this removal to other building? The speaker, the sermon, and the congrega-on were the same. Only the building was different. Does is really meet St. Paul's difficulty about women speakers in age when there were no church buildings, so that (whatever meant) he could not have meant that the building was the bidden thing? Or does trailing across the road from church school-house seem the sort of thing to which Christ would ve attached importance? Surely such pettifogging ecclesias-ism only brings discredit upon the Church. We need to

* *C.L.W.S. Monthly Paper*, Jan., 1917.

look at the whole question from a wider and saner standpoint. Respect past traditions—Yes, but not be fettered by them. Every tradition was once an innovation. A living Church guided by the Holy Spirit will not be afraid of new movements and of new ideas, but will give them a fair and patient examination in a spirit of sympathy rather than of mere querulous criticism.

In July, 1914, the question of the position of women in connexion with the Councils of the Church came before the Representative Church Council, and for the first time they were given the right of voting on the same terms as men in the election of Church Councils. It will be remembered that before this date a "qualified Church voter" meant in the case of a male one who was of full age, and an actual or potential communicant of the Church of England, while a woman in order to vote must be a ratepayer as well as a communicant. What an extraordinary instance of ecclesiastical statemanship! A statemanship that, as it was pointed out, would have effectually disfranchised the poor widow who cast in all that she had into the treasury of God, but would have retained the more prudent Sapphira on the roll of Church voters. Let us be thankful that such an indefensible anomaly has now disappeared. Women were also declared to be eligible as members of Parochial Church Councils, and the writer of this paper can testify from his own experience of their usefulness on such a body. A further proposal to allow women to become members of Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences was lost. The voting showed that while a majority of the bishops (13 to 8) were in favour of the proposal, a small majority of the clergy (39 to 36) and a large majority of the laity (94 to 27) were against it. Once again the ecclesiastical layman showed himself the opponent of progress and reform in the Church. One of the great lessons some of us have been trying to enforce during the National Mission is that when we speak of the Church we mean the whole Body and not the clergy only. A person "goes into the Church" not when he is admitted to holy

orders, but when he is baptized and received "into the congregation of Christ's Church." There is apparently a further lesson to be taught, and that is that the Laity are not all of one sex, but that if St. Paul's great principle of Gal. iii. 28 is true, the laywoman should have an equal standing with the layman, and equal opportunities for rendering counsel and service to the Church of God.

When we see the increasing importance assigned to women's work in the State, and the way in which women are being called upon to serve on Boards of Guardians, Committees, and Councils of one kind or another, it is not for the Church—the Church that owes so much to the devoted service of women—to lag behind and to refuse them their just and rightful position. The Woman's Movement has come to stay. What women are doing for the nation at the present time is daily adding to its strength. What attitude is our Church going to adopt towards it? Too often in the past it has failed to recognise the signs of the times, and has met new movements—such *e.g.*, as the Methodist Movement in the 18th century, and the Labour Movement in our own day—with suspicion, coldness, and indifference. How often have the words of a memorable military dispatch describing an incident in the present war been sadly true of the Church of England:—

"Inertia was the one fatal error. And inertia prevailed."

And heavy indeed is the price we have paid for such an attitude. Things are moving, whether we like it or not. Let us who believe in a living, and therefore progressive, Church meet these new movements with sympathy, and claim all that is worthy in them for Christ and His Church.

THREE CRUCIAL QUESTIONS.

By the Editor.

1.—What is the basis of Church Authority?

The Church claims authority. She claims to be obeyed in the sphere of religion and morals. At the present time there is no more crucial question than: What is the right basis of Church authority? And Modern Churchmen cannot be too insistent as to what they believe to be the right answer to that question.

Evangelical Churchmen may reply in answer to the question: The authority of the Church is rightly based on the Church's possession of the Scriptures.

Anglo-Catholic Churchmen may reply: It is rightly based on the Church's possession of an Apostolic Succession and Tradition which can be traced back to the Apostles of Christ Himself.

Modern Churchmen must reply: It is rightly based on the possession of the Spirit of Christ.

Modern Churchmen therefore cannot admit the validity of either of the first two claims as giving the desired authority.

The possession of Scriptures written eighteen centuries ago is not a sufficient reason for listening to the Church to-day.

The possession of an unbroken historic official ministerial connection with the Church of the Apostles is no reason for conceding to their successors the moral and spiritual authority which we should concede to the Apostles themselves.

The only sound basis for Church authority to-day is that authority which the Apostles themselves claimed in their first council at Jerusalem, namely, the possession of the Spirit of Christ. They put forth their first conciliar decree or decision with these words:—

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."—Acts xv. 28.

There, tremendous as it is, stands the basis of Church authority for every age—the possession of the Holy Spirit—that Spirit which Christ promised should be with His disciples to the end of time.

"But," says the modern man, "I gravely doubt the authority of the Church to-day, and on the very grounds on which you claim it. Christ has authority for me in faith and morals—the authority of a majestic religious personality. The Bible has authority for me in faith and morals, the authority of a great religious and moral classic; but the Church of to-day has no authority for me, and that on the very grounds on which you claim authority. The Church does not possess the Spirit of her Founder, and she is not true to His ideals. It is true she claims to impart that Spirit by laying on of hands and by other ancient ceremonies, but I see no evidence of her possession of that Spirit, nor of its reception by those to whom she claims to impart it in this way. I compare the spirit of the Christian Church to-day with the Spirit of her Founder—that Spirit was one of love, and truth, and fearlessness. I turn to the Christian Church to-day, and I do not find that love, and truth and fearlessness are her marks. Christians are all divided; their *odium theologicum* is a by-word with the world; those who otherwise would be united by national and social bonds are divided by the spirit of ecclesiastical differences in matters doctrinal, institutional, and liturgical. The Christian Church claims to speak with the authority of the Spirit of Christ, I say before I accept her claim to authority, let her shew me that she has that Spirit. Do not misunderstand me," he continues, "I am not against the Christian Religion, but I am against the Christian Churches and their claims. I reverence Christ; I accept His great unveiling of God as the Father of all men. I acknowledge the supremacy of His high ideal of human life as rightly realised in the love of God and in the love of man, but I am against the churches and their officers who claim to speak in His Name and to possess and transmit His Spirit. They seem, with exceptions, to have very little of Christ and of His

Spirit in them. They do not love what Christ loved and hate what He hated. They do not really love their fellow-men, although they frequently call them "dearly beloved brethren." They do not really love the truth, they are mortally afraid of it. They divide men against each other, and they unknowingly repel men from Christ and His Gospel, and yet they dare to claim in this twentieth century Christ's authority for their institutions and regulations, and, above all, for themselves. I say when I see the mind and the spirit of the Master in them I will listen to them, but not till then."

Now that I take it is the view, articulate or inarticulate, of vast numbers of men in our modern communities, with regard to Church authority, and I take it that until the Church or Churches in modern Europe are genuine centres of love and light and truth and courage, claims to Church authority only serve as an irritant and a laughing-stock. Church authority is bound up with the Church's love of truth and the Church's spirit of deep and wide and sincere love of man.

Hence the Church's authority must be to-day a moral and spiritual thing. It must rest entirely, not on apostolic succession or historical continuity, not on the possession of Scriptures and Sacraments, but on the possession of the Spirit of Christ, which is, above all, a Spirit of love and truth and service. The charter of Church authority is found in Christ's words: "Whosoever wishes to be great among you, let him be your servant . . ." and in St. Peter's words: "Not as lords over God's heritage, but as ensamples to the flock."

Wherever and whenever the Church in utter unselfishness and self-forgetfulness serves humanity by ministering to its needs of body, mind and spirit, by striving to promote its higher intellectual, moral and spiritual life, the authority of the Church is great. *For the measure of the Church's authority is the measure of the Church's service.* Just in so far as the Church shares her Lord's Baptism of death unto sin and selfishness, and drinks her Lord's cup of service and sacrifice, she will sit on her Lord's throne. The Church's

authority is the authority of love, of sacrifice, of attraction, of influence. It is internal not external. It wins and leads and inspires. It does not compel and rule, neither does it anathematize and excommunicate.

The Church's authority shews itself in two ways—negatively and positively.

Negatively the Church shews her authority by those whom she repels. She does not excommunicate such; they excommunicate themselves.

> "They went out from us because they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would have continued with us." (i *John* ii. 19).

In other words they excommunicated themselves because "they loved the darkness rather than the light." The Church in its practice of excommunication would have done well to have followed the example of the Saviour rather than that of the Synagogue. Let an anathematising and excommunicating Church remember that Christ did not excommunicate even from the band of his apostles, the doubter Thomas, the deserter Peter, the traitor Judas.

Positively, the Church shews her authority by her power to win the world to Christ. The infallible test of the true Church is the presence of the Spirit of Jesus in her, and there is always one mark of the presence of the Spirit of Jesus, and that is power (δύναμις). "Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you," is according to S. Luke the last promise of the Lord Jesus to his Church. (*Acts* i, 8). And where there is power (δύναμις) there is moral and spiritual authority (ἐξουσία).

It was this authority, dependent upon His power, which was so conspicuous in Jesus Himself. "He taught them as one having authority." (Mk. i, 22). It was also the mark of His Apostles and of the early Church. The sure sign of the Church's decadence (as Archbishop Benson pointed out in one of the most remarkable of his Charges) is when Church authority becomes divorced from this power of the Spirit.

The absence of power in the Church is the clear sign to all men that the authority in the Church lacks the Divine sanction.

2.—Ought the Church to be more loyal to Orthodoxy than to Truth?

What is Orthodoxy? It is the truth in the form in which it was held by the Church of past generations. Is that the truth to-day? That is an open question, but the Church authorities seem to wish to regard that question as closed—closed for ever. They desire apparently, at whatever cost, to identify truth with the statements in the creeds, articles, and other church formularies. Here the modern Churchman cannot agree with the Church authorities. This resolve to identify traditional truth with actual truth makes the heritage of the past, which we have in our Church formularies, an incubus and not a blessing. It makes the Church a by-word for her skilful evasion of the question: What is the truth? It discloses the Church to the world as worshipping the fetish of an old-world orthodoxy and not as worshipping the ever-present Spirit of Truth, and so the men of to-day whom the Church wishes to convert will have nothing to do with her. All her affirmations are suspect. For the world of to-day says in her ears a thousand times over and in a thousand different ways: "We are not interested in orthodoxy. It is nothing to us. But we are very much interested in truth, and apparently you have no interest in it nor any special means of finding out what it is." And yet this is the tragedy of the situation. The Church was promised by her Founder a Spirit which should guide her into all truth; in other words, a Spirit which in moral and spiritual matters should endow her with the power of the progressive apprehension of the truth. Yet she seems to the modern man little disposed to use and trust that Spirit. There is as Sir Isaac Newton called it "the great undiscovered Ocean of Truth," to be traversed in the course of the world's history, yet the Church dare not leave the sheltered harbour of the Apostolic Age or of the first four General Councils. She has no mind to trust the wind of the Spirit of Truth; she has no mind to steer by the Stars—the eternal principles of Jesus; she dare not go beyond the buoys at the harbour mouth. Very well, men who are truth-seekers will charter for

their voyages the ship of Science or the ship of Philosophy or the ship of Art, and leave the old women to enjoy their harbour excursions in the ship of the Church. When the ship of the Church really realises that truth is progressive, or rather that the human perception of it is, she will not go on appealing to the past as authoritative for the present day. The past may be profitable, instructive, inspiring, but it is not authoritative.

In this matter the Church needs to realise that the search for truth must be conducted by modern scientific methods and in the scientific spirit. The scientific method is God's revelation to the modern world, and in certain cases at least the scientists are His prophets. The Church too often, as did Judaism, persecutes her prophets and detests their spirit—or else she laughs or weeps them down. She does not honour or welcome them. The sorriest apologist for her most worn-out traditions, the feeblest defender of things as they are, has more honour with her than the most fearless of her truth-seekers and truth-speakers.

Another thing the Church has need to realise is the practical character of truth. In the Middle Ages men delighted in scholastic speculation. "How many angels can dance on the point of a needle?" That is not the need to-day. Men want practical guidance as to how to live and think and feel in this present world.

Many fundamental questions lie behind those great obvious practical ones, and the Church must try to answer them in the light of our modern knowledge and experience. Moreover she must both by precept and example point men to the value of experiment, and make it clear that in cases where speculation fails experiment may succeed. At present she is chained down by past speculation, and dreads modern experiment. It is on experimental proof that she must learn to rely.

The realities of the Christian religion to-day are not to be established by proofs drawn from miracles, or prophecy, or by undesigned coincidences, or by any other of those theologians' curiosities which some of us have secured at such great cost,

and have treasured with such pious care. The infallible proof of the Christian religion is its value in life. What is it really achieving in the formation of personal character and national character? Is it giving fullness of life? Is it helping us to touch reality? Does it justify itself all round in our individual and social and political experience? In short, to use Father Bernard Vaughan's elegant phrase: "Is the Church delivering the goods all the while?"

I read the transactions of our Convocations, and of our Diocesan Conferences, and it seems to me that this belief in practical, experimental, Christian truth is mainly conspicuous by its absence.

Again in this matter of truth the Christian Church professes to believe in prayer as a means of learning the truth. In that case she believes in present-day inspiration. Prayer quickens the faculties and helps us to use them rightly, but a whole-hearted and courageous love of truth, and a resolution to go wherever the Spirit of Truth leads us, must be combined with the laborious effort to use all the resources for learning the truth which God has made known to us in this age, if the Church would advance rightly into the truth. Frankly, I find this Spirit lacking in many cases.

But possibly the Church is not interested in truth because she believes that she possesses the Truth absolutely. What her Saviour gave her is the key to Truth. That key is found in the Saviour's attitude towards God and towards Man, towards life and towards death, towards the sinner and towards the righteous, towards Judaism and towards the Kingdom of God. His Church has to learn how to use that Key in every crisis of her history, mental, moral, spiritual, social, national; and the Spirit of Truth, if the Church is faithful and earnest, will enable her to use that Key aright.

Never were truer words written than these:—

> "Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still and onward,
> Who would keep abreast of truth."

The Church has to keep abreast of the deepest thought, the latest knowledge, the highest aspiration in her environment and community, if she is to know how to teach the Gospel of Jesus with that influence which it is needful for human welfare that it should exert.

Only by so doing will the Church demonstrate to the world that she does possess that Spirit of Truth which was promised to her by her Lord.

3.—How is the Church to be united?

Christ prayed that His followers might be one. The history of the Church proves how needful that prayer was. To-day the Church is divided into several hundred, more or less antagonistic, sects. How is the Christian Church to be united again? Human nature being what it is, and selfishness and self-assertion being rooted deeply in it, the first and last need in the securing of re-union is the presence of the Spirit of truth and love in every Christian heart. This will not mean that all Christians will think alike in matters of belief and practice. God has not formed us to do so. It will mean that we shall all gladly unite in Holy Communion, and that the Spirit of truth and unity in Christian minds will replace the fetishes of orthodoxy and uniformity.

The Lambeth Quadrilateral* is too late and too complicated to form the basis of re-union. The only basis for re-union is that of being disciples of the one Master; worshippers of the One Father; sharers in the One Holy Spirit of love and truth, and therefore bound to recognise each other as members of the one body.

This means that we must allow our fellow-Christians a large measure of freedom in doctrinal views, liturgical practices, and institutional organization; and they must do the same by us. Here the Church of later times has lost its sense of proportion. Things which are neither explicit nor implicit in our Saviour's Gospel are insisted on as essentials for Christian re-union

* This consists of (1) The Bible, (2) The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, (3) The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, (4) The historic episcopate.

to-day. Not in these things can we be one, but only in "the truth as it is in Jesus." These other things may be called Evangelical or Catholic or Orthodox or by any number of other well-sounding titles, but until we cease to regard them as *essential* we cannot have re-union. When once we will confess that they are not essential, and show ourselves willing to sacrifice them all on the altar of Christian Love—love of Christ and love of the brethren—we shall be able to have them all back again, if we wish it, I have no doubt at all.

In Khartoum Cathedral, there is a window of three lights representing Faith, Hope, and Love. Faith is the central figure, she is majestic and crowned. Hope and Love on either side are uncrowned and comparatively insignificant. There you have a symbol of the departure of official Christianity from the Religion of Christ and His Apostles. For them Love was the greatest, for us Dogma or Apostolic Succession or valid Sarcraments or inspired Scriptures. But until we return to Jesus and the Apostles in this matter, neither Authority nor Truth nor Re-union will be the possession of the Church.

All the Church's present day weaknesses might be conquered did she realise better what she is. She is the company of the disciples of Jesus and she should be the earthly tabernacle of His Spirit. Later ages have called her the Church—Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Orthodox. Early ages were satisfied to call her the Church of God or the Church of Christ. There is one of her early titles we might do well to revive. In primitive times she was called the Spirit-bearing Church (πνευματοφόρος). That title soon ceased to be used. Yet how different might the history of the Church have been, had Churchmen been earnest to ask in every age and locality: "Is my branch of the Church Spirit-bearing?" "Are the fruits of the Spirit, love, truth, joy, peace, righteousness, holiness, conspicuous and abundant in her life?" Perhaps it is reserved for the Churchmen of to-morrow to put these questions to themselves and to hear a wondering and repentant world reply: "Yes, indeed."

WHAT IS TRUE IN RELIGION?

By the Rev. H. Northcote, M.A., Boulogne-sur-Mer.

Men have spent much time, and not a little temper, over the question—*Which is the true religion?* They ask this even in respect of one form of Christianity as compared with another.

Without saying that the question is wholly unimportant, I am not going to discuss it here. I am thinking rather in terms of another question, which has been fairly persistently asked in modern times—*What is true in religion?*

I should have wished to have dealt first with religious feeling. That was made by the late William James and others, the subject of some very interesting studies. But I have no space for this. Let us think rather of religion, and especially of Christianity, as it stands out in front of us, an object on the screen of history. How is it made up,—this phenomenon of religion that you see in front of you, expressing itself in all sorts of ways, in richly adorned churches, in bare conventicles and rooms; in set services, and in extempore worship; in systems and sequences, in spontaneous outbursts of feeling and utterance; in all colours and in no colours; in poetry and in sober prose; with infinite variety of sound and music, and again in mysterious silence; by a thousand activities darting hither and thither throughout the world, and again in a temper and attitude of complete contempt for, and aloofness from, the world? Yes; how is it made up, and what is going to come of it all in the sequel, all these contradictory and mutually exclusive forms of religious expression, which one would think would long ere this have destroyed objective religion by their internal friction; and yet religion lives on.

Well, just as subjective personal religion—the feeling of being religious—is made up of various constituents or factors, so it is with objective religion.

One thing that has operated very largely in religious history, is *superstition*. Let us not be afraid of the word, even though we are bringing it into a certain connection with Christianity.

What is superstition? Well, it explains itself. *Super, stare:* to stand or remain over, to survive. Superstition is what remains over of men's crude and ignorant ideas.[1] All science and all religion—they are really hardly more than two aspects of the same thing—begin in conjecture, in tentative interpretations, in guesswork. Even when men have had religious revelations, they have had to conjecture their meaning and the inferences to be drawn from them.

When, then, men hold on to their forefathers' notions about one thing and another, even when the clearest proof has been given that those notions were wrong, that is superstition. It is superstition to hold that the earth is flat and the heavens solid. It is superstition to say that the heart, not the brain, is the organ of intellect. It is superstition to say that comets are harbingers of evil, or that the stars are alive. It is superstition to believe in witches and demons. It is superstition to believe in lucky and unlucky days.

Yet all these beliefs were once part and parcel of religion, nay, of Christianity; not of the Christianity that ought to have been, but of the Christianity that actually was. Superstitious beliefs are often referred to in the Bible, and sometimes it looks as if they were accepted and endorsed there. That was, perhaps, unavoidable. The spiritual revelation had to be given to its first hearers in terms of their forefathers' ideas. Thus the Israelites spoke of the heart as the organ of mind, and had apparently no word for *brain;* and evil and disease, as we know, are often spoken of Scripturally in terms of demonism. All the same, the Bible, taken as a whole, contains progressive principles of faith and interpretation, which show that the Revelation of God in Christ was not really indissolubly bound up with such ideas.

[1] Gaster, art. Charms and Amulets, in Hasting's *E.R.E.*, vol. 3, p. 452.

But Christians have been slow to realise this. Even now, if you look at Christianity in bulk, so to speak, the whole big phenomenon called the Christian world, you see plenty of superstition; plenty of the false guess-work beliefs and interpretations that were put forward in the obscure past, and that have remained over and stuck on, and still influence men.

And another factor or tendency in religion is *magic*. Magic, like religion, recognizes the existence of invisible powers; and magic claims to have special ways, short and easy ways, to the privileged few who can use them, for managing the unseen powers. Christianity dislikes the term magic very much indeed, but all the same Christianity in its practical working has retained a good deal—less now than formerly, but still some—that is magical rather than religious in character; special dodges and devices for getting right with God and with unseen powers in general, without putting oneself to too much personal moral effort.

Then there is *mysticism*. This operates in Christianity very largely. It has helped to produce the Christianity that we see and know. What is mysticism? Well, it has a connection both with magic and superstition; in fact, it is difficult to isolate entirely these different tendencies or forces in the production of religion. Mysticism means getting into close touch with the unseen powers, and with God. The mystic in Greek religion, belonged to an inner spiritual circle, which claimed to have a greater knowledge than common, of God and the unseen world. Early Christianity was certainly a good deal influenced by the surrounding forms of mysticism. It is true that the real inner life-principle of Christianity, the revealed grace of God through Christ, existed independently of those forms of mysticism. That is the supernatural determining factor to which I am going to return presently. But I do not think there is any doubt that the old mystery religions in the Roman Empire helped to mould the form of a good deal of the Christianity that developed and became visible, as time went on.

The main difference between magic and mysticism is that mysticism is much higher ethically than magic. Magic—religious magic—lets you off the necessity of making moral effort of your own; mysticism calls you to such moral effort. Magic says it can put you right with the unseen powers by devices of which it holds the secret; mysticism says it can indeed bring you into touch with the unseen powers, but you must try to be personally holy yourself. Perhaps some will think I am speaking too boldly, but I know I am right when I say that some of our sacramental doctrine would be magical, would be superstitious, if it were not for the mystical element in it. If we said Baptism and Holy Communion and Absolution put men right with God, and they need not take any trouble about being good,—that would be magical and wrong. But when we say Baptism and Holy Communion are full of the grace of God offered to men, and when they receive it they must try to live worthily of it,—that is mystical and right.

Then, once again, a tendency that we see acting in religion, one of its formative principles, is *rationalism*. No word, perhaps, has been more misunderstood and abused, in connection with religion, than this word rationalism. People often employ it, as if it meant unbelief and atheism. But really it means just using your reason. And that is not only a right, but a duty. St. Paul has bidden us, in understanding be men.

We need, in fact, to try and understand the religion, the Christianity, that we see before us. That, in conjunction with the experience of life, is the way to judge religious values. How are we going to deal with Superstition, with all those false notions that remain over from the past, except by rationalism, by using reason? If it had not been for rationalism, we should all be cowering in terror of devils and demons now. Rationalism, the use of reason, only goes wrong in religion when you expect too much of it. We ought, if we are humble-minded and reasonable, to accept the position that Christianity

oes give us some things which our reason cannot grasp in
eir entirety.

Christian rationalism can and does remind us that our
ilure fully to grasp these mysteries may be due not to any
efect in their intrinsic truth, but to our own intellectual
mitations. Aristotle showed that the human mind, here,
ow, on this earth, is limited to nine ways or categories of
inking; but it does not in the least follow that those nine
ays are all that the human mind ever will use, in other and
et other states of existence. It is absolutely reasonable to
low, and even to expect, that in the hereafter we shall be able
grasp spiritual and religious truths in *new* ways, by *new*
tegories of thought. And in the meantime, we do well to
elieve in them.

But now we must take account of the determining factor in
bjective Christianity. There is something in objective
hristianity which assures us that in spite of all the variations
id contradictions it presents, we do right to believe in it.
'e are not confronted by an illusion.

We know that Science consists in acquiring, bringing into
e field of consciousness, a large number of facts and data,
id then understanding their relations by the help of leading
eas. It is essential that those leading ideas should be true.
the leading idea *gravitation*, or if the leading idea *blood-
rculation*, were false, modern astronomy and modern
ysiology would go all to pieces and scientific progress would
op. In his *History of the Inductive Sciences* the great
hewell showed that the reason why science, and human
ogress generally, retrograded in the Middle Ages, was that
en lost sight of certain leading scientific ideas.

Now, the case is exactly the same with religion, at any rate
th Christianity. Christianity presents us with two leading
mprehensive truths or ideas, which St. John puts before us
two short propositions, *God is Light*, and *God is Love*.
ere you have the summing up and concentration of its
pernatural spiritual force. If we hold on to those two leading

ideas, then all the cross-currents and contradictions in subjective religion, in men's religious feelings, are bound to work out right. If we hold on to those ideas, we shall be able to see all the diverse historical elements in Christianity in the right perspective and in their real inter-connection.

All that comes down out of the past—tradition and superstition—is subject to the operation of these governing ideas.

The effect of that operation is twofold, destruction and transformation. Traditions that are misleading or confusing to the moral sense, superstitions that are socially harmful, are being destroyed by Light and Love. It is the function of those spiritual forces to do it, as physical light destroys disease-germs. Traditions and even superstitions that can be made use of, that illustrate moral truth and attract men to it by their social significance or aesthetic value,—these will stand; and when the work of the reinterpretation of Christianity has been done on a sufficiently general scale, will reappear, transformed, in the system of doctrine which will be its matured product.

GLIMPSES INTO THE CATHOLIC MIND.

A REVIEW.*

By the Rev. Canon RASHDALL, D.C.L., F.B.A.

This remarkable book opens with an address on "Continuity of thought and relativity of expression," delivered by Professor Sanday at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union, and already printed in the *Modern Churchman*. It is followed by three letters of Mr. Williams and two replies by Dr. Sanday, who also writes the Preface. From Dr. Sanday we all know what to expect. We have all admired the splendid courage with which, in old age, he has boldly announced the completion of a long process of gradual conversion to a definite Liberalism, and these papers are only another expression of a point of view which has become familiar to us, It would be almost defended upon the basis of a Pragmatism with which I cannot believe

* *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition.* A friendly discussion between W. Sanday, D.D,, Lady Margaret Professor, and Canon of Christ Church, and N. P. Williams, M.A,, Chaplain Fellow of Exeter College. Longmans, Green & Co., 1916.

npertinent to praise the work of the veteran theologian. But Mr. Williams a less known writer, and the glimpses which these letters afford into the ind of a clever and well-informed High Churchman—he would probably efer to be called "Catholic"—form one of the most interesting revelations religious psychology with which we have met. And, therefore, I hope I ay be excused for devoting more attention to Mr. Williams' contribution an to Dr. Sanday's. Mr. Williams tells us what, for the most part, his Catholic" friends never will tell us; he attempts to set down in black and hite what are the ultimate premisses of his belief, and how he manages to cape from drawing what to many of us seem the obvious inferences from cts, which to such men as himself—we may add that such men are not so ery numerous in the ranks of his party—are as well known as they are to r. Sanday.

If I do not attempt to develope in full the argument of Dr. Sanday's iginal paper, it is because many of my readers will already have read it in ie pages of this periodical, and because it is in substance well known ven to those who may not have read that particular paper. Dr. Sanday evelopes the familiar distinction—accepted in some sense and to some tent by all of us—between "relative and absolute truth," and defends the inciple of accepting the Creeds and other formularies as containing relative, not always absolute, truth. The following sentences will sufficiently ggest the line of thought:—"I think that we should all be on our guard gainst 'denials.' I do not think that a blank and unqualified denial—utting a 'not' into the Creed—is anywhere required of us." "Relative uth, it should be remembered, is still essentially truth and not falsehood. or many long centuries it may have been the best truth available. In any se, it is what God has willed for a time, if not in permanence; and we ould never think or speak of it otherwise. The fact alone precludes the ssibility of 'denial.' Relative truth is not negatived, but superseded he nearest analogy in nature is the way in which the snake sloughs its in. The old skin does not come off until the new skin is fully formed." r. Williams, in his reply, takes as common ground between himself and s opponent, these two propositions:—(I.) In the Christian faith as it has me down to us we can distinguish between *form* and essential *content*. I.) The essential *content* (at least) is beyond the power of man to alter hatever may be said about the *form* or *expression*." Their difference lies in e questions "What is form?" and "What is content?" Mr. Williams, of urse, admits the gradual growth of the formulae used in the Creeds and the Councils; but goes on to dispute the proposition that "the categories ed by the Councils in formulating the great ideas of the faith, were such have been outgrown by the modern world;" and proceeds to make the ther startling statement that "the thought-forms of which the Creeds and nciliar definitions make use, seem to me to be quite reasonably few and mple—*ousia*, *physis*, *hypostasis*, *prosopon*, *thelema*, *energeia*,[1] and the like"; and es on to maintain "that the categories mentioned above are not peculiar to cient thought, but are inherent in the structure of human thought, as

[1] Mr. Williams gives these terms in Greek letters.

such." It is surprising that a scholar so well acquainted with the facts should blind himself to the enormous amount of what is absolutely arbitrary in the use, fixed after centuries of controversy, of these terms, and to the extent to which such usage differs from that which would be adopted by any modern school of philosophy. After all, he leaves out what is, perhaps to the modern mind, the most difficult "category" of all—that of *Logos*. The term and the idea were perfectly familiar to ancient thinkers, but what modern philosopher (except when writing as a Christian apologist) uses it now? Can it be satisfactorily translated by any one English word? But, even if we confine ourselves to the terms selected by Mr. Williams, does he deny that *ousia* and *hypostasis* originally meant to the ancient thinker practically the same thing (as Dr. Bigg, for instance, tells us), and that it was by a quite arbitrary distinction that it was eventually agreed to say "there is one *ousia* in the Trinity, but three *hypostases?*" Is it quite obvious why we may say that there are three *Personae* in the Trinity, but not that there are three *Prosopa*, that we may say that there are three *hypostases*, but may not talk of *tres substantiae*, (although *hypostasis* is simply the Greek for *substantia*), or, at least, not without a careful explanation that we are using *substantia* in the sense of *hypostasis*, and not in the sense of *ousia?* Would any modern thinker use these terms in precisely the same way? Does any modern thinker use "person" in the sense in which Tertullian or St. Augustine spoke of *tres personae*—a sense compatible with attributing "one mind" to three persons—or distinguish in the ancient way between *ousia* or "essence" and "substance." Mr. Williams tells us that he finds these terms "simple." How many clergymen could say exactly what was meant by the distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* at any one period in the history of the Catholic doctrine—to say nothing of the different senses in which they were understood at different moments? Do not most clergymen assure us on Trinity Sunday that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is a "mystery," and that we must not presume to understand it? It is true that they have not all had the advantage of Mr. Willams' tuition. Mr. Williams tells us that he has never found any difficulty in explaining the Chalcedonian doctrine of our Lord's Two Natures to pupils or simple-minded parishioners. Perhaps not, but is Mr. Williams quite sure that his explanation is really identical with what was meant by the fathers of Chalcedon, or John of Damascus? And does he suppose that any modern philosopher would say that soul and body were two "natures" which retain their own "properties" of after their union in man? It is not so much that the proposition would be denied, but the question is not one which would be raised in that form. I am not one of those who find a special difficulty in modernizing the Chalcedonian formula, but I am quite sure it does not represent the way in which any modern thinker would have expressed himself if left to his own guidance. Equally amazing is it that a writer of Mr. Williams' knowledge should seriously declare that "the primitive Church, as it stood on the morrow after Pentecost . . . held, in what we should call pictorial and imaginative form, the very same general idea of the Divine Sonship of Christ which was formulated three hundred years later by the Nicene Fathers in the more

precise, abstruse, and intellectual terms of the Homoousion formula." It is difficult to understand how any one who has read the *Acts of the Apostles*, can suppose that the ideas, either of the author or of the Apostles whose preaching he describes, were substantially the same as those of Athanasius, or that the Christology even of 1 Cor. xv. (and this was long after Pentecost) is the same as that of Nicaea. There was continuity between them, no doubt; the development of the one into the other may have been legitimate, and even intellectually necessary, but to talk about "the same general idea" would be about as reasonable as to say that the acorn is the "same thing" as an oak, or that the British Constitution of 1917 represents "the same general idea" as the Parliament of Simon de Montfort. Sameness, of course, there is in all these cases, but there is difference too, and the difference is as conspicuous as the sameness. And could not an Adoptionist make out as plausible a case for the essential sameness of his idea of Christ with that of the early Church of Jerusalem? And the contention becomes still more amazing if, instead of comparing the theology of "the Church as it stood on the morrow of Pentecost," we were to institute a comparison between the theology of the second century and that of the fourth. The comparatively vague and elastic theology of the New Testament was no doubt capable of many developments (the Nicene included), just because so little was defined. But that cannot be said of conceptions which are just as definite as those of Nicaea, but flatly opposed to them. Is it not now a commonplace of dogmatic theology to say that the so-called Semi-Arians were simply the Conservatives, and that Athanasius was the real innovator? This, of course, decides nothing as to the relative value of the rival definitions. I should myself be prepared to contend that the Council of Nicaea saved the Church from the Polytheism into which it was practically drifting. Throughout this part of the discussion, though he often shows dialectical skill, Mr. Williams seems to reveal his great inferiority to Dr. Sanday in what I may call historical sense. He seems to have little or no eye for the difference between the ideas and modes of thought of different periods. His attempt to show that the metaphysical ideas of the Conciliar epoch require little or no remoulding to make them acceptable to a modern mind, will probably seem, to most of our readers, by no means impressive.

Mr. Williams is, I think, more effective when he comes to deal with what I may call the philosophy of Dr. Sanday's distinction between "absolute" and "relative" truth, and his attempt to apply it to the historical statements of the Creeds. Especially is that the case with regard to the Virgin Birth. Mr. Williams is less unanswerable when he attempts to show that the clauses which assert the Resurrection and the Ascension are not susceptible of "degrees of truth" or differences of interpretation. But I am bound to say that Dr. Sanday pushes his "no denials" formula to an unreasonable extent. As a measure of policy or of charity, it may often be desirable for Liberals—especially in the pulpit—not flatly to deny traditional beliefs, but rather to be silent, to treat them as open questions, or to re-interpret them. But Dr. Sanday's attempt to show that all statements which were once thought true, and had good spiritual effects on those who believed them, remain "relatively true" now, and cannot ever—from the

point of view of science or history or logic— become "false," could only be Dr. Sanday would have much sympathy. At that rate all the errors of bad history or bad science might be regarded as "relatively true," because (as Dr. Sanday argues) God once allowed them to be believed. That practical religious teaching should be as "positive" as possible, we should all admit, but it is too much to say that a scholar should never deny an historical statement which he believes to be baseless. Dr. Sanday's mind is not pre-eminently speculative, and yet he has rather a disposition to run up into metaphysical or logical discussions which give his younger opponent a certain, though perhaps a rather superficial, advantage over him.

I will not attempt to follow the various steps of the argument between the disputants; it is too condensed to be subjected to a further process of compression. The most interesting things in the book are the revelations which it contains as to the state of Mr. Williams' mind upon two points— (1) the authority of the Church; (2) the question of miracles.

Mr. Williams confesses that the whole of his Christian belief rests upon the authority of the Church, and that the authority of the Church is for him an *a priori* axiom or "intuition"—assented to in the same way in which we all assent to the propositions "two and two make four," &c., or to the fundamental principles of morality. Sometimes it seems to be the infallibility of the Church which is taken as an "undemonstrated first principle," and all the articles of the Creed—including the historical statements—are then accepted on the strength of that infallibility alone; elsewhere we are told—what is hardly the same position—that "a single intuition which assures me of the truth of Catholic Christianity as a whole, is enough for me; having once, so to speak, got inside the Catholic system, I have nothing further to do (so far as the essentials of the faith are concerned) than to ascertain what, as a matter of fact, are its contents." (p. 63). The first reflection which occurs to me on this amazing confession is "What a complete *volteface!*" This is, surely, quite a different position from anything which was ever maintained by fathers, schoolmen, apologists, the leaders of the Oxford movement. The old attitude, surely, was "It is proved by historical evidence that Christ said, and did such things; therefore He was God; therefore all that He said was true; He has told us that the Apostles and the Church should have the power of judging infallibly on matters of faith and morals; and they have decided such and such things: therefore we believe them, apart from any judgment of our own as to their truth." Such, I should judge, from his books (though I do not know that he has ever discussed the subject systematically) would be the attitude of the present Bishop of Oxford. If, after all, the authority of the Church is to rest upon an intuition—which, admittedly, many people do not possess, Catholics can no longer reproach Protestants (liberal or orthodox) with the extreme "subjectivity" of their religious beliefs. Candid Roman controversialists have always admitted that the individual has to use his private judgment to decide upon the claims of the Church—to decide what Church he is to believe, to what authority in that Church he is to look, and what, in point of fact, that authority has taught. But, then, they appealed in support of their own answer to that problem to the common laws of thought, the facts of history sifted and

erified by the best historical science of their day, and the inferences to be rawn from them in accordance with principles practically admitted and cted upon by all mankind. Now it appears that everything rests upon n intuition which is certainly absent in the great mass of modern educated ersons, and which is seldom claimed even by those whose actual theology the same as that of Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams appeals to the testimony f East and West, but he can hardly make any use of the testimony of oman Catholics; for, if they have any intuition on the subject, it would be, resumably, that the Pope, or possibly a Catholic Church which excludes nglican and Eastern schismatics, is infallible. If their intuition is right, Ir. Williams must be wrong; equally little could he appeal to those astern theologians whose intuitions (if they have any) would tell them at "the Church" does not include persons like the Pope and Mr. Williams, ho were (in all probability) not baptised by immersion. Surely a modern hillingworth would find much to say on these ambiguities. Catholics ave not always agreed among themselves on the precise seat of authority, nd this is for the present purpose all-important. In his own solution of the uestion, Mr. Williams falls into the usual circle: "The ecumenity of the cumenical Councils resides precisely in this, that their formulations were ubsequently accepted by the whole Church." But they were *not* universally ccepted. The decrees of Nicaea were not universally accepted at the time, nd there are still Nestorian and Monophysite Churches which can only be uled out by defining "Church" as the body of Christians which accepts the so-called) Ecumenical Councils.

I will not attempt to carry the argument further, but I should like to ay one word as to the essential difference between the "intuitions" which as Mr. Williams rightly sees) form the ultimate basis of all knowledge, and ne intuition which Mr. Williams claims as the basis of the Catholic faith. n the first place, Mr. Williams' alleged intuition is one which could not ossibly be assented to until a vast amount of historical knowledge had been cquired. This intuition of the infallibility of the Church could not be cquired except by a man who knew what the Church is, what it has actually aught, something of its history, of its present constitution and influence, and ne like. I do not know that there is anything quite parallel to this in any f the other intuitions to the analogy of which Mr. Williams appeals; and part from this, the truth of the intuition can hardly be assumed unless the mpirical facts by which (as is admitted) the intuition is at least suggested, re correctly apprehended. Many readers of these pages will be tempted to uspect that what presents itself to Mr. Williams' mind as an intuition may eally be psychologically due to a by no means impartial and objective view f the facts. Secondly, the truths which are claimed by a sound logic as elf-evident are always truths which present themselves as self-evident to ne normal human mind. It is true that it is not necessary that they should e recognized with equal clearness, or even recognized at all, by every sane uman being. There have been great classical scholars who could not pprehend the first principles of mathematical reasoning: there may be self-vident truths which are only apprehended by the few. It may be therefore at "Catholics" are persons who possess this exceptional degree of

intellectual insight. But it is surely not very likely that a belief which is never found among persons not acquainted with the facts of Christian history, which has never occurred to the millions who have lived and died as Protestants during the last few hundred years and who know as much of the facts as Catholics, which is not consciously possessed or claimed by the great majority even of "Catholics," which is certainly absent among the great majority of highly-educated persons even when brought up as Catholics, should be a genuine intuition. Mr. Williams seems to rely much upon the mere number of Catholics as creating a presumption that what they believe should constitute the true content of Christianity, if it is true at all. Assuming that this intuition is to be regarded as really an intellectual truth, and not a mere emotion, is not this presumption somewhat weakened by the fact that the truth in question would not only not be treated as self-evident but would be positively denied by the vast majority of the more educated classes alike in the "Catholic" countries and in others? And if Mr. Williams should fall back upon the suggestion that what is wanted is not intellect or intellectual education, but some super-intellectual kind of spiritual insight, is this superior spirituality of "Catholics" at all obvious?* I am myself a strong believer in the objective validity of our ultimate moral judgements, but I certainly should feel my confidence in their validity very much weakened if I found that there were whole nations who had absolutely no moral consciousness, and that among Christian nations the moral consciousness was habitually weakened by education, and apparently quite non-existent in 90 *per cent.* of the highly educated. Mr. Williams would perhaps be inclined to point to the fact that large numbers of the highly educated would deny the validity of any *a priori* moral axiom, or would explain them as mere emotions; but this would no more weaken my conviction than the fact that J. S. Mill persuaded himself that 2+2 might not =4 in the region of the fixed stars. The great majority of these people all habitually act (more or less) and judge and (except in controversial moments) think as if they believed in an authoritative moral consciousness, while the behaviour of the 90 *per cent.* of the highly educated is certainly not such as to suggest that they believe in the infallibility of the Church. I need hardly add that many even among very High Churchmen, though they may have a high estimate of the authority of the Church, deny that it amounts to infallibility. As soon as the "infallibility" is weakened into a mere presumptive probability of being right, the apologist cannot discharge himself from the duty of examining on their own merits the judgements of his authority, and it may turn out that some of them are erroneous.

And now let us see what is Mr. Williams' attitude towards the question of miracles. Dr. Sanday has declared his belief in events which are *supra naturam*, while he disbelieves in alleged events which are *contra naturam*, and

* He admits the value of the testimony of Quakers and Salvationists as far as it goes, but "disputes their right to use it as evidence for purely negative beliefs" (p. 74). Mr. Williams is too good a logician not to know that *omnis affirmatio est negatio*. The positive intuitions of the Quaker often involve the negation of those of the Catholic. If God gives such inner light as the Quaker claims, the exclusive claims of the "Catholic" Church become false. A Catholicism which is not exclusive is surely a very modern and even modernist Catholicism.

he has defined nature as meaning "the laws of matter and motion." This amounts to the assertion, as Mr. Williams not unfairly infers, that events do not happen which cannot be explained by the laws of physics and chemistry, and this gives him the opportunity of a very telling reply: "If the real is that, and that only, which is explicable by the laws of physics and chemistry, what becomes of personality, thought, religious experience, consciousness and life itself?" (p. 127). Every case of voluntary motion is, upon such a view, as much *contra naturam* as the bodily Resurrection and Ascension; and if nevertheless Dr. Sanday accepts the possibility and actuality of the former, why not of the latter? I am bound to say that here Mr. Williams seems to me to have momentarily the best of the argument. The matter is not, indeed, philosophically quite so simple as Mr. Williams seems to suppose. There are idealistic and other philosophers of eminence (Lord Haldane for instance) who would be far from treating mental events as mere "epiphenomena" or from thinking that they could be explained in terms of physics and chemistry, who would nevertheless contend that the laws of matter and motion are never "contradicted." Higher laws and "categories" come into play, but the lower are never contradicted. They would accept a formula very like Dr. Sanday's distinction between *contra* and *supra naturam*. In his final reply to Mr. Williams in the Preface, Dr. Sanday makes just this distinction: "It is a very different thing to say that certain alleged events must not 'contradict' these laws, and to say that they must be wholly explicable by them." For my own part I do not see how it is to be denied that physical laws are contradicted by voluntary motion in the sense in which one law of nature may be said to contradict another. Let us then admit that in a sense the laws of matter and motion—or rather *some* of these laws—may be said to be "contradicted" not only by voluntary motion, but by all biological phenonema, *i.e.*, that things happen which the physicist would be justified in declaring to be impossible if he took into account the physical and chemical aspects of nature alone. Does it follow that we can accept miracles in the common sense of "exceptions to the laws of nature"? Dr. Sanday was, I venture to say, wrong in defining (in an unguarded moment) "nature" as equivalent to the laws of matter and motion: but he is quite right, when in his reply he insists that there are such things as biological and psychological laws, that some kinds of action of mind upon matter are in accordance with those laws and others not, while Mr. Williams seems to deny or ignore the existence of such laws. I will not raise here the difficult question as to what is the ultimate basis of induction; but on any view we must surely admit that we can by induction discover "laws" in the region of biology and even of psychology which we have as much reason for trusting as the laws of physics. Any man of science would say that the reanimation of a dead body would be as much a violation of the laws of nature as a case of "levitation" (in the reality of which Mr. Williams expresses his belief), while he has no difficulty in admitting the phenomenon of faith-healing or of hypnotism. Experience tells us that the laws of physics, or *some of them*, are contradicted in certain ways and certain directions, but never in others; and from experience we are able to formulate, though generally with less precision, laws which enable us to

predict what will and what will not happen with as much confidence as that which we feel as regards the course of purely physical and chemical phenomena. The growth of an acorn into an oak cannot be explained in terms of physics and chemistry, but we are practically certain that it will not grow into a chestnut tree. Experience tells us that we can move certain parts of our bodies by an effort of will, but not others, that we can move our own bodies but not our neighbour's, a stone which we can touch but not one in the next room, and so on. As Dr. Sanday says, "The interaction of spirit and matter . . is a cosmos and not a chaos."

All historical criticism assumes that alleged violations of the one kind of law may be as confidently set aside as alleged violations of the other, or (for those who, like myself, regard the uniformity of nature as merely a generalization from experience) that it would require an immensely larger mass of evidence to justify the acceptance of an alleged violation of these laws than we require to establish an event which can be explained in accordance with these laws. All judgments as to motive in history assume that psychological miracles are as little to be expected as physical miracles. Mr. Williams seems to assume that, if we once grant the *a priori* possibility of a "miracle," no more historical evidence is required to establish a miracle than to justify belief in the most natural event. He remarks that "it is interesting to have it (apparently) admitted that the Modernist campaign against the literal acceptation of the Creeds is now based, not so much upon accepted facts as upon considerations of *a priori* probability" (p. 27). How are we to "ascertain" the "facts" of history except by criticism which is based upon the assumption that the laws of nature prevailed in the past as they do in the present? If I accept a historical "fact" because I find it recorded in Thucydides, and Thucydides lived at the time, I am assuming that certain laws of nature hold. Once admit that the devil might have inspired Thucydides to tell a lie without a motive, or that the MSS. were simultaneously corrupted by some supernatural agency, and all possibility of ascertaining "facts" disappears. Mr. Williams does, indeed, require some evidence for a miracle, but apparently not much. He regards the universal flood as not merely unproved but disproved. While believing in some Old Testament miracles (he does not tell us which), he has doubts about others. When he comes upon a miracle such as Elisha making the iron swim, he will "pencil a note of interrogation in the margin and pass on." Is this all that he really does when he finds such stories in the pages of a secular historian? And if he does at least put these notes of interrogation in the case of the Old Testament, why not in the New? Here he quite reasonably insists upon the better historical character of the Gospels as compared with the Old Testament records; but, after all, his main insistence is upon the infallibility of the Church. Yet has not the "undivided Church" guaranteed the historicity of the Old Testament and the dogma of biblical infallibility as strongly as it has guaranteed the truth of any New Testament miracle? At bottom, Mr. Williams seems to rely upon the *essentiality* of certain New Testament miracles to the Catholic faith, while he pronounces others "unessential." The question may be raised whether this is not really a very private and subjective interpretation of the "Catholic faith." Before Catholicism was

affected, more or less, by modern conceptions of the universe, all Catholics would have said so. Once deny the truth of one part of the Bible, and you have no reason for believing the rest; that was the unanimous attitude of Protestants and Catholics alike. And the great majority of the ignorant Christians, upon whose opinions Mr. Williams places so much reliance, would say so now. Mr. Williams would, doubtless, laugh at Renan's insistence that if the Church was wrong about the historicity of Daniel, it may be equally wrong about other things; but it is difficult to see on what grounds he can assert his right to pronounce all miracles but three to be not absolutely essential to the Catholic faith (though he is himself inclined to believe in a much larger miraculous element), while he denies, on the ground that they are "essential," Dr. Sanday's right even to "pencil a note of interrogation" against any of these three. The mere fact that the Church has put these, and not the others, into a particular summary of its faith at a particular time, can hardly make this world of difference. Surely the only reason why biblical infallibility was not made an article of the Creed was that no Christian thought of disputing it.*

The book is one which ought distinctly to help the sections of the Church represented by the disputants to understand one another. The discussion is conducted with excellent temper on both sides. If Mr. Williams sometimes has the advantage in verbal dexterity and strict logical consistency, I do not think on the whole his friends will thank him for his denudations of the "Catholic" foundations. Dr. Sanday, on the other hand, strikes us as fundamentally reasonable, even when an occasional over-eagerness to find points of agreement lands him in logical difficulties. To most modern minds it will appear a sufficient exposure of the extreme precariousness of Mr. Williams' position when he admits that, if the discovery of an early papyrus at Nazareth should disprove the Virgin Birth, Mr. Williams would, "without hesitation, abandon, not merely the belief in the Virgin Birth, but the whole of Catholic Christianity as well." It is, however, satisfactory to find that while for himself he is prepared to accept the "all or nothing" position in an exaggerated form, he will not insist upon others doing the same. While he has probably some intellectual contempt which his politeness only just succeeds in veiling for those who occupy a middle position like Dr. Sanday, he is not prepared to excommunicate them. Not only does he expressly disclaim the usual accusation of "dishonesty," but he does not, apparently, wish to deny them a place in the Church, or even in the ministry; he is prepared to speak of the differences between himself and his venerable opponent as "surface differences in regard to certain beliefs," which he traces to "divergences, not very great or permanently irremediable divergences, in respect of fundamental and indemonstrable first principles."

I can only express a hope that Mr. Williams and his friends will always be prepared, in practice and not merely in "friendly discussion," to extend a similar toleration to Liberals less eminent than Dr. Sanday, and who are perhaps more in need of it.

H. RASHDALL.

* When an Origen questions the historical character of some Old Testament event, this is because he had an even stronger theory of inspiration than those who believed it.

THREE IMPORTANT NOTICES.

We draw the attention of our readers, especially members of the Churchmen's Union, to the following notices. The first deals with elections to the Council of the Churchmen's Union. It is held under the new regulations which in the case of the Council have two objects particularly in view: the first is to maintain a continuity of experience and policy; and the second to secure an infusion of new blood every year. Questions are asked why such and such excellent members are not on the Council. The answer is that in all probability the person who perhaps was best acquainted with their excellency did not think it worth while to nominate them for election. Where our members are so numerous and so widely scattered, it is obviously impossible for the Hon. Sec. or other officers of the Union at headquarters to be acquainted personally with all those who are best fitted to guide and inspire our policy by sitting on the Council. Members of local branches now have special opportunities for supplying valuable nominations based on personal knowledge, and we venture to hope that this opportunity will not be missed.

NOTICE I.

ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

To all Members of the Churchmen's Union.

In accordance with a Resolution passed at the last Annual Meeting, the following ten members of the Council retire this year, and are not eligible during the next twelve months:—The Dean of Peterborough, Canons Papillon and Foakes-Jackson, Revs. J. Gamble, H. D. A. Major, W. C. Roberts, T. F. Royds, J. R. Wilkinson, Dr. C. Norwood, and Mrs. Reith. Members are therefore reminded that any *two* members may nominate *one or more* members of the Union as candidates for the forthcoming election of **ten** members of Council. Each name nominated requires a proposer and a seconder.

Such nominations must reach the Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks, **not later than 1st May, 1917.**

If the nominations exceed the number of the vacancies, voting papers will **afterwards** be sent by post, and the result declared at the Annual Meeting in London.

NOTICE II.

The **ANNUAL MEETING** will be held in **London** on THURSDAY, 21st JUNE, 1917.

12 noon. **Corporate Celebration of the Holy Communion** in St. Sepulchre's Church, Holborn. Preacher: The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Southwark.

3-30. **General Meeting** (open to the public) in the Hall of Sion College, The Embankment.

Chairman: Professor PERCY GARDNER, F.B.A.

Speakers: Mr. CLUTTON BROCK.
THE MASTER OF BALLIOL.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.

5. **Tea.**

5-30. **Business Meeting** (open only to members of the Churchmen's Union).

Chairman: Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

NOTICE III.

The **FOURTH CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN** will be held at **Girton College, Cambridge,** from August 8th to 13th.

All information as to tickets and accommodation is supplied by a leaflet inserted in this issue, or can be obtained on application to Miss Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.

The subject of the Conference is **The Church,** and the preachers, readers of papers, and order of events, are as follows:—

Wednesday.—

6-0 p.m., Evensong, with Sermon by the Right Rev. Dr. MERCER (late Bishop of Tasmania).

9-0 p.m., Opening Address by Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Thursday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *Did Christ found the Church?*
The DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.
Rev. H. E. J. RAWLINSON (Senior Student of Christ Church).

5-0—6-45 p.m., *The Ministry of the Church—Its origin.*
Rev. ALFRED FAWKES.

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Ministry of the Church—Its functions.*
Professor W. J. ASHLEY (Professor of Economics at Birmingham University).

Friday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *The Authority of the Church.*
Rev. H. H. SYMONDS (Assistant Master at Rugby).

5-0—6-45 p.m., *The Spiritual Independence of the Church.*
Canon RASHDALL, F.B.A. (Fellow of New College).

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Church and the Churches.*
Dr. CYRIL NORWOOD (Master of Marlborough).

Saturday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion, with Address by the Rev. C. R. Shaw Stewart.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *The Church and the Sacraments.*

Mr. C. C. J. Webb (Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford).

Rev. C. F. Russell (late Fellow of Pembroke, Cambridge).

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Church and the Fine Arts.*

Professor Percy Gardner.

Sunday.—7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-30 a.m., Mattins and Sermon.

6-0 p.m., Evensong and Sermon.

Monday.—7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

West London Branch.—The twenty-second meeting of the West London branch of the Churchmen's Union was held at 72, St. George's Square, S.W., by the kind invitation of Mr. and Mrs. F. H. Anson, on March 20th, at 8 p.m. The Rev. E. Miller took the chair. The Hon. Sec. announced his resignation owing to his being called up for National Service.

Votes of condolence with the relatives of Lady Stapley and the Rev. W. E. Addis were moved.

The Rev. L. Patterson read a paper on *Raymond*, and the following took part in the discussion:—Revs. E. Bury, T. Lloyd, Messrs. Kimber, Bosanquet, Sir Laurence Jones, and Miss Ellis.

Surrey Branch.—The second meeting of this branch was held at Hillside, Wimbledon Common, by the kind invitation of Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Hart.

The Rev. Hubert Handley delivered an inspiring address on "What can we do?" He urged that the increase of knowledge in our times had led to a wider outlook on religious problems, and that this ought to be recognised in the formularies of our Church. He combatted vigorously the popular misconception that the Broad Churchman is destructive not constructive. He affirmed that in calling ourselves "Liberal Christians" we imply that "Liberal" is only the adjective, but "Christian" the substantive. The "Broad Churchman" is temperamentally sympathetic to modern movements, but he also preserves his critical faculty.

At the conclusion of Mr. Handley's address, Lt.-Col. Seton-Churchill called the attention of the meeting to the new proposals for the government

of the Church by an ecclesiastical committee of the Privy Council, and asked Broad Churchmen to unite with Evangelicals to oppose these revolutionary and dangerous proposals.

At the conclusion of the meeting several new members joined the branch.

Manchester Branch.—A meeting of this branch took place at 6 p.m. on Friday, March 23rd, in the Onward Buildings, Deansgate, Professor M. A. Canney being in the chair. There was a good attendance to hear a paper by the Editor of the *Modern Churchman*.

Mr. Major's subject comprised the triple problem of Authority, of Truth, and of Reunion. A resolution was passed by the meeting requesting that the paper be published in the *Modern Churchman*.

In proposing a vote of thanks, the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson assured Mr. Major that the principles and ideals associated with his paper were shared by a very much wider circle than he perhaps suspected.

A resolution in the following terms was then proposed by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, and seconded by the Rev. Canon Edwardes Rees: "The Manchester Branch of the Churchmen's Union desires to express to Dean Henson their appreciation of and gratitude for, his action in accepting the invitation to preach at the City Temple, and hope that his doing so will help to promote that closer relationship which we believe should subsist between the Church of England and other Christian Communions."

The resolution was passed, with only two dissentients, and these explained that their opposition was based not upon principle, but upon certain practical considerations.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MANUALS' FUND.

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

Sir,

I enclose herewith a list of guarantees and donations towards the Manuals' Publication Fund. The total to date is £215 12s. We ought if possible to reach £300. My hope is that we may receive a number of small donations from 2/6 upwards. My belief is that there are many who would give them, and to such I now venture to appeal.

Lucy Reith,

Westfield, Ilkley,
9th April, 1917.

Hon. Treasurer of Manuals' Fund.

Guarantees.

Mr. P. H. Bagenal, £10; Mr. Herbert M. Boughton, £10; Rev. J. R. Cohu, £10; Mr. S. W. Farmer, £10; Rev. J. Gamble, £10; Professor Percy Gardner, £10; Canon Glazebrook, £10; Mr. W. B. Gordon, £10; Mrs. Mark Hammond and Miss Emery together, £10; Rev. H. D. A.

Major, £10; Master of Marlborough, £10; Misses Maude, £10; Mr. Llewellyn Preece, £10; Rev. J. R. Shaw-Stewart, £10; Sir Richard Stapley, £10; Mr. J. W. Williams, £10; In Memory of the late Miss Younghusband, £10. Total £170.

DONATIONS.

Rev. F. E. Abbott, £5; Sir T. C. Dyke-Acland, £5; Rev. A. E. Burdekin, £5; Miss Clay, £5; Mrs. Gossage, £5; Rev. J. M. Jeakes, £5; Canon Papillon, £5; Rev. W. Ritson, £5; Rev. Chas. Bass, £1 1s.; Miss Deards, £1; Mrs. Farrer, £1; Mr. V. Kemball, £1 1s.; Miss Yates, £1; Rev. H. Northcote, 10/-. Total £45 12s.

[We wish to support strongly this appeal for smaller sums. £300 given or promised should be ample to enable us to proceed as soon as the conditions of the publishing trade become somewhat more normal.—ED. *M.C.*].

MATTINS AND HOLY COMMUNION.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

The correspondence in the March issue of the *Modern Churchman* must be of vital interest to those readers whose activities are practical rather than academical. But is it not a mistake to head the correspondence "Mattins *v.* Mass?" The better way surely is "Mattins *and* Holy Communion."

In this parish, for nearly five years, we have had Mattins said followed by (after a short interval) the Holy Communion, Sermon, and Hymns. The parishioners, however, communicate at this service. We have what is generally termed an early service for the benefit of those people who prefer to worship in that way. These people, however, attend the principal service at 11 with the happy result that both extremes come to the Holy Communion at the same time, the majority to partake, the others to set a good example of devout behaviour. We have no special vestments or ornaments, and outwardly the Church would strike the observer as being "low" rather than "high."

Two well-known dissenting ministers while here on holiday have attended the 11 a.m. Holy Communion. One of them received the elements and came afterwards to me to say that he felt that, after hearing the words of invitation and constrained by the general atmosphere of the service, he could not refuse the proffered hospitality. This may not be the kind of contribution required upon so difficult a subject; but the conviction grows upon one that in the sphere of religion too little is attempted and too much said. If every incumbent would try to carry out the rubrics there would be far less controversy and fruitless argument.

Walton West Rectory,
Little Haven, Pembrokeshire,
March 26th, 1917.

A. T. WOODMAN DOWDING.

P.S.—It would be a privilege to be able to get into touch with others who may have a desire to have services of the simple kind outlined above.

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.